

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SYLVIA WYNANDA SEEGRIST,	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
vs.	:	CIVIL NO. 1:CV-05-1278
KEITH TOLAN, M.D.;	:	(Judge Caldwell)
SUE SPRINGER, PSS II;	:	
BARBARA DOEBIER,	:	(Magistrate Judge Smyser)
Head Physshologist;	:	
SHIRLEY MOORE, Superintendent;	:	
and SHARON M. BURK, Chief	:	
Grievance Officer,	:	
Defendants	:	

O R D E R

THE BACKGROUND OF THIS ORDER IS AS FOLLOWS:

We are considering the report and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge which recommends that we dismiss the Plaintiff's amended complaint¹. On November 14, 2005, the Defendants filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's amended complaint. The Plaintiff, Sylvia Seegrst, did not respond to this motion and on January 13, 2006, the Magistrate Judge ordered Seegrst to respond to the Defendants' motion or he would recommend that her case be dismissed for failure to comply with an order of the court. The Magistrate Judge further informed the Plaintiff that he would

¹ The Magistrate Judge ordered the Plaintiff to file an amended complaint (doc. 6) because her original complaint (doc. 1) was illegible.

construe the Defendants' motion to dismiss as one for summary judgment since they had submitted documents outside the pleadings. As a result, he informed Seegrist that she was free to file any documents supporting her claims with her response to the Defendants' motion. The Magistrate Judge set the deadline for Plaintiff's response as February 3, 2006. Seegrist failed to file a response.

On February 16, 2006, the Magistrate Judge filed his report recommending that Plaintiff's amended complaint be dismissed for failure to follow his order directing her to respond to the Defendants' motion. Since the report was submitted the Plaintiff has filed twenty-four separate documents (Docs. 28, 31-53) with the court. We assume that these are her objections to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.

After careful review of the documents, however, we find that they are largely unintelligible. They are either written in illegible handwriting or foreign languages and do not seem to have any relation to the Defendants' motion to dismiss or the Magistrate's report. Therefore, we will adopt the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint.

AND NOW, this 26th day of April, 2006, upon consideration of the Report of the United States Magistrate Judge (Doc. 27), dated February 16, 2006, Plaintiff's objections thereto, and an independent review of the Record, it is Ordered

that the Magistrate Judge's Report is adopted. It is further Ordered, pursuant to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation, that Plaintiff's amended complaint (doc. 6) is dismissed. The Clerk of Court shall close the file.

/s/William W. Caldwell
William W. Caldwell
United States District Judge